

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/841,357	04/24/2001	Robert A. Wiedeman	900.0003USU	6251
41339 75	90 09/30/2004		EXAMINER	
KARAMBELAS & ASSOCIATES			NGUYEN, BRIAN D	
655 DEEP VALLEY DRIVE, SUITE 303 ROLLING HILLS ESTATES, CA 90274		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
KOLLING IIIL	Eb Eb IIII Eb, Cit 7027	•	2661	

DATE MAILED: 09/30/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		A	1,
	Application No.	Applicant(s)	سا
	09/841,357	WIEDEMAN ET AL.	
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Brian D Nguyen	2661	
The MAILING DATE of this communicate Period for Reply		th the correspondence address	
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICA: - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communica: If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) da: If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutor: Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, I Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	TION. CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a relation. ys, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirt y period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MON by statute, cause the application to become AB	eply be timely filed y (30) days will be considered timely. THS from the mailing date of this communication. ANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	
Status			
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed of	n the application filed 4/24/01.		
2a) This action is FINAL . 2b)	☑ This action is non-final.		
3) Since this application is in condition for		•	
closed in accordance with the practice u	inder <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D	. 11, 453 O.G. 213.	
Disposition of Claims			
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-22</u> is/are pending in the appli	cation.		
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are w	rithdrawn from consideration.		
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.		·	
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-22</u> is/are rejected.			
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.			
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction	and/or election requirement.		
Application Papers			
9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Ex	caminer.		
10)⊠ The drawing(s) filed on <u>14 August 2001</u> i	s/are: a)⊠ accepted or b)□ ob	ected to by the Examiner.	
Applicant may not request that any objection	to the drawing(s) be held in abeyan	ce. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).	
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the	•	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by	the Examiner. Note the attached	Office Action or form PTO-152.	
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119	,		
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for to a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority doces. 2. Certified copies of the priority doces. 3. Copies of the certified copies of the application from the International	uments have been received. uments have been received in A ne priority documents have been	pplication No	
* See the attached detailed Office action fo	r a list of the certified copies not	eceived.	
Attachment(s) 1) X Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	A) [] Intensions S	ummary (PTO-413)	
2) Dotice of Praftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-	Paper No(s)/Mail Date	
 Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO Paper No(s)/Mail Date 	/SB/08) 5) Notice of In	formal Patent Application (PTO-152)	

Application/Control Number: 09/841,357

Art Unit: 2661

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Objections

1. Claim 4 is objected to because of the following informalities:

Claim 4, line 2, "DSN server" seems to refer back to "(DSN) server" in line 5 of claim 1. If this is true, it is suggested to change "DSN server" to ---the DSN server---.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 3. Claims 1-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lee et al (6,161,008).

Regarding claims 1-5, Lee discloses a mobile satellite telecommunications system, comprising: at least one user terminal (140, 142); at least one satellite in earth orbit (138); and at least one gateway (118) bidirectionally coupled to a data communication network (102); and a Domain Name Service (DNS) server (108, 150) for responding to a DNS query that is received from the user terminal; wherein the at least one satellite is in a non-geosynchronous orbit and further comprising at least one satellite in a higher orbit (see figures 1-2; col. 4, lines 3-6; col. 5, lines 7-12). Lee does not specifically disclose the at least one satellite comprises a DSN server and the at least one satellite in a higher orbit comprises a second DSN server. However, to include a DSN server in the satellites is a matter of design choice because a DSN server is a separate

Application/Control Number: 09/841,357

Art Unit: 2661

element that perform the same function no matter where the DSN server is located.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to attached the DSN server to the satellites in order to provides

an association between an IP address and a device domain name for users in a satellite

network.

Regarding claims 6-11, claims 6-11 are apparatus claims that have substantially the same limitations as the apparatus claims 1-6. Therefore, they are subject to the same rejection.

Regarding claims 12-12, claims 12-22 are method claims that have substantially the same limitations as the respective apparatus claims 1-5. Therefore, they are subject to the same rejection. Note that DNS servers at different levels are in communication with each other to share information and update the database.

Conclusion

4. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Dillon et al (6,658,463), Wills et al (6,584,082), Willis et al (6,385,647), Nandikonda et al (6,314,111), and Lee et al (6,751,459).

5. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Brian D Nguyen whose telephone number is (571) 272-3084. The examiner can normally be reached on 7:30-6:00 Monday-Thursday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kenneth Vanderpuye can be reached on (571) 272-3078. The fax phone

Page 4

Application/Control Number: 09/841,357

Art Unit: 2661

number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

9/28/04

BRIAN NGUYEN